

B) Remarks:

Applicants wishes to thank the Examiner for pointing out the indefinite language in the claims. Applicants have accordingly modified the claim language with the exception of the lack of antecedent basis indicated in claim 1 at line 6.

Claim 1 has now been incorporated in its entirety into claim 2. In line 6 of the claim, the Examiner questions the antecedent basis for "said host computer". However, in lines 5 and 6 of the claim, the claim calls for a database of interactive experiences in a storage medium of a remote "host computer" coupled to the network.

Claim 1, now claim 2, is a method claim and it is considered that this is a positive recitation of an element in a method claim and that since "said host computer" refers to the same host computer there is therefore proper antecedent basis.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 - 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dornbush et al. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Regarding the rejection of claim 2, the Examiner states in paragraph 7 of the action on page 4 that Dornbush teaches providing index capabilities in the host computer whereby a participant user may exit

participation at any desired time and will be automatically returned to the place of termination upon re-accessing the database for continued participation, and in support of this the Examiner cites Dornbush at column 7, lines 34 - 40; column 21 at lines 1 through 10, and column 7 at lines 60 -67. Applicants have carefully studied the cited portions of Dornbush and it is respectfully submitted that they do not teach or even suggest what is maintained by the Examiner.

Lines 34 through 40 of column 7, merely indicates that the knowledge management system 68 of Dornbush may collect all quiz items having high Power Scores and index them for simplified search and retrieval.

Lines 60 through 67 of column 7, merely indicate that students may interact with the system asynchronously, but still share the same deadlines. It is further here stated that small groups or individuals may utilize the system by accessing questions and data saved from earlier instances of the same course.

Lines 1 through 8 of column 21, merely states that Power Questions, including the course materials and the knowledge store, are preserved. It is further stated that this process may be continued for a variety of different course materials and is repeated for each student or team of students.

However, nowhere in these recitations, or for that matter elsewhere in Dornbush, is it even suggested that the host computer can be programmed with index capabilities whereby the participant user may exit participation at any desired time and will be automatically returned to the place of termination upon

re-accessing the database by the participant user for continued participation. The portions of Dornbush pointed out by the Examiner do not disclose this capability, nor do they even begin to suggest the capability to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Next, the Examiner states that with regard to Applicants' claim 3, that Dornbush teaches that the interactive experiences are learning experiences for a learning management system and that accessing includes accessing at least one course component learning experience selected from the group consisting of learn, complete course work, demonstrate knowledge, self-evaluation and share course work. For support the Examiner refers to column 10, lines 49 through 67 of Dornbush.

Referring specifically to lines 49 - 67, here Dornbush only discloses that the work may be reviewed by teammates. Nowhere does this reference teach or even suggest that interactive learning experiences are learning experiences for a learning management system and that they may be accessed in the form of a learning experience consisting of one or more of "learn, complete course work, demonstrate knowledge, self-evaluation and share course work."

Accordingly for this reason, it is respectfully submitted that claim 3 is not anticipated, and for that matter is not even suggested, by Dornbush, and additionally, since claim 3 depends upon claim 2, claim 3 is also considered to be allowable for the reasons previously given with regard to claim 2.

Next, the Examiner maintains that Dornbush anticipates Applicants' claim 4 as indicated in lines 44 - 50 of column 8 of the reference. However, this reference portion of Dornbush merely discusses current course announcements for the students. Common user functions appear as a set of navigational functions. These functions include jumping to the home page, jumping to the library or course resource repository, e-mail directly to the instructor, general discussions with teammates, contact sensitive help for the current screen, feedback e-mail sent to course administrators and faculty to change user preferences.

However, Applicants' claim 4 calls for accessing the learn component of the course component learning experiences by accessing at least one course section selected from a group consisting of course objective outline, provision of learning materials, tools for navigating selected portions of the host computer learning management system and display of concepts. This is not what the quoted portion of the reference suggests or teaches and therefore once again, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 cannot be anticipated by Dornbush. In addition, since claim 4 is dependent upon claim 3, it is also believed that claim 4 is allowable for the same reasons given with regard to claims 2 and 3 upon which claim 4 depends.

With regard to claim 5, the Examiner once again relies on Dornbush at column 10 in lines 49 - 67. This portion of the reference provides review by teammates. To the contrary, claim 5 requires that accessing display of concepts includes accessing at least one of the display of concepts selected from a group consisting of engaging interaction, website visit, real-world simulation, hard copy documentation and electronic collaborative communications. Once again, this group is not disclosed and in fact is not even

suggested by the referenced portion of Dornbush. Dornbush does not suggest such a group and only discusses review by teammates.


Accordingly it is respectfully submitted that Dornbush does not anticipate claim 5, and in addition, claim 5 is further allowable for the reasons previously given with regard to the allowability of claims 2, 3 and 4 upon which claim 5 depends.

Reconsideration is also respectfully requested with regard to remaining claims 11 through 10 and 12 for the same reasons previously given.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is now believed that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration with formal notice of allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CAROTHERS AND CAROTHERS

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Floyd B. Carothers".

Floyd B. Carothers
Attorney for Anthony G. Matous and
Bruce A. Moser
Fort Pitt Commons, Suite 500
445 Fort Pitt Boulevard
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

FBC:jkc
Reg. No. 24,252
(412)471-3575
(412)281-2180 Fax



I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Services as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on Nov. 2, 2004
CAROTHERS AND CAROTHERS

Jean K. Carothers